

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-12 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, Applicants amend Claims 1, 4 and 5.

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's indication that claims 4, 5, 10, and 11 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the features of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 1-3, 6-9, and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Matsuda (JP 2000-138553). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of Claims 1-3, 6-9, and 12.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite:

A surface acoustic wave filter comprising:
a piezoelectric substrate;
an insulating pattern disposed on the piezoelectric substrate
and having permittivity less than that of the piezoelectric substrate; and
a conductor pattern disposed on at least one of the
piezoelectric substrate and the insulating pattern; wherein
a portion of the conductor pattern defines IDTs and another
portion of the conductor pattern defines wiring traces; and
**at a portion where wiring traces having different
potentials face each other in a plan view, a ground wiring trace is
disposed directly on the piezoelectric substrate; and
at least one of the wiring traces having a different
potential from that of the ground wiring trace is disposed on the
insulating pattern.** (emphasis added)

With the unique combination and arrangement of features recited in Applicants' Claim 1, including the features of "at a portion where wiring traces having different potentials face each other in a plan view, a ground wiring trace is disposed directly on the piezoelectric substrate" and "at least one of the wiring traces having a different potential from that of the ground wiring trace is disposed on the insulating pattern," Applicants have been able to provide a surface acoustic wave filter in which a portion of the conductor pattern is disposed on the insulating pattern, the portion on the insulating pattern is not directly in contact with the piezoelectric substrate having a high

permittivity and is held on the piezoelectric substrate through the insulating pattern having a lower permittivity than that of the piezoelectric substrate. Accordingly, parasitic capacitance between that portion and another portion of the conductor pattern is reduced by the insulating pattern (see, for example, the last full paragraph on page 4 of the originally filed specification).

The Examiner alleged that Matsuda teaches all of the features recited in Claim 1.

Applicants have amended Claim 1 to recite the features of “at a portion where wiring traces having different potentials face each other in a plan view, a ground wiring trace is disposed directly on the piezoelectric substrate” and “at least one of the wiring traces having a different potential from that of the ground wiring trace is disposed on the insulating pattern.” Support for the amendment to Claim 1 is found, for example, in the first full paragraph on page 21 of the originally filed specification and in Fig. 1 of the originally filed application.

In contrast to Applicants’ Claim 1, Matsuda teaches that all of the IDT electrodes 2 and the extended electrode extensions 6 and 7, which the Examiner alleged correspond to the wiring traces recited in Applicants’ Claim 1, are disposed on the wiring patterns 4, 5, 9, 10, 11, and 12 and on the insulating layer 8 disposed on the wiring patterns 4, 5, 9, 10, 11, and 12 (see the English language Abstract of Matsuda). In other words, none of the IDT electrodes and the extended electrode extensions 6 and 7 of Matsuda is disposed directly on the piezoelectric substrate 1.

Thus, Matsuda certainly fails to teach or suggest the features of “at a portion where wiring traces having different potentials face each other in a plan view, a ground wiring trace is disposed directly on the piezoelectric substrate” and “at least one of the wiring traces having a different potential from that of the ground wiring trace is disposed on the insulating pattern” as recited in Applicants’ Claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 1-3, 6-9, and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Matsuda.

Application No. 10/773,818
May 1, 2007
Reply to the Office Action dated February 6, 2007
Page 7 of 7

Allowable Claims 4 and 5 have been amended to be in independent form including all of the features of originally filed Claim 1.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1, 4 and 5 are allowable. Claims 2, 3, and 6-12 depend upon Claim 1, and are therefore allowable for at least the reasons that Claim 1 is allowable.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are solicited.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-1353.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: May 1, 2007

/Christopher A. Bennett #46,710/
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

KEATING & BENNETT, LLP
8180 Greensboro Drive, Suite 850
Tyson's Corner, VA 22102
Telephone: (703) 637-1480
Facsimile: (703) 637-1499

Joseph R. Keating
Registration No. 37,368

Christopher A. Bennett
Registration No. 46,710